



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/596,743	08/15/2006	Stefan L. Bartscher	16785.3	1021
22913	7590	03/18/2009		
Workman Nydegger 1000 Eagle Gate Tower 60 East South Temple Salt Lake City, UT 84111				
EXAMINER				
KENNEDY, JOSHUA T				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3679				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/18/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/596,743

Applicant(s)

BURTSCHER, STEFAN L

Examiner

JOSHUA T. KENNEDY

Art Unit

3679

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 February 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 2/18/2009 has been entered.

Claims 1-17 have been examined.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to because the double line cross hatching for the various sectioned components (i.e. Elements 22, 32, 33, etc) is improper. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency.

Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Abstract

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and **generally limited to a single paragraph** on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

Claim Objections

Claim 8 is objected to because of the following informalities: --formed by two likewise wedge-shaped partial layers with different moduli of elasticity.-- should be inserted after "is" on line 2. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Claims 1-8, 10-13 and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Oizumi et al (Japanese Patent Publication 2003/278314).

Regarding claim 1, Oizumi et al disclose an anchorage for at least one pre-tensioned or stressed tensile element, the anchorage comprising:

one or more wedges (2,4) having a first region near a load and a second region remote from the load (Fig 3);

an anchor body (3), wherein a tens transmittable to the anchor body by means of the one or more wedges; and

wherein the one or more wedges have a wedge shape to slide along an inclined surface of the anchor body to force the one or more wedges against the at least one pre-tensioned or stressed tensile element (Fig 3), the one or more wedges comprising:

a first wedge-shaped layer (4; concrete) adjacent a second wedge shaped layer (2; metal) having modulus of elasticity that is lower compared to the modulus of elasticity of other parts of the anchorage including the second wedge-shaped layer (Concrete is known to have a lower modulus of elasticity than that of metals such as steel), wherein a greatest thickness of the first wedge-shaped

layer (4), measured normal to the longitudinal axis of the tensile element, lies in the region of the anchorage which is near a load (Fig 3), wherein the first wedge-shaped layer lowers a stiffness of the one or more wedges in the first region near the load to more evenly distribute contact pressure on a contact area between the at least one pre-tensioned or stressed tensile element and the one or more wedges.

Regarding claim 2, Oizumi et al disclose pores (Fig 3, Examiner considers concrete to be a porous material and is thus comprised of pores) being arranged in the layer formed from the material having a lower modulus of elasticity to reduce the stiffness thereof in a direction normal to the longitudinal axis of the tensile element.

Regarding claim 3, it is the patentability of the product, and not recited process steps, that is to be determined in product-by-process claims irrespective of whether or not only process has been recited. Accordingly, it is of little consequence how the layers of different moduli of elasticity were formed when layers of different moduli of elasticity are present. See MPEP § 2113.

Regarding claim 4, Oizumi et al disclose the anchor body (3) as a coupling for two tensile elements being provided with seats for wedges, the seats being are oriented opposite to each other (Fig 3).

Art Unit: 3679

Regarding claims 5 and 10, Oizumi et al disclose the layer formed from the material having a lower modulus of elasticity is connected to an adjacent layer having a higher modulus of elasticity via a non-positive or a positive connection comprising a profile with a counterprofile (Fig 3).

Regarding claims 6 and 11, Oizumi et al disclose a transmission of shearing force between the wedge and the tensile element is ensured by a non-positive connection or by form closure comprising friction/ the shaping of a profile (Fig 3).

Regarding claims 7, 12 and 13, Oizumi et al disclose the anchorage significantly as claimed, but do not disclose the ratio of the lower modulus of elasticity to the a higher modulus of elasticity is at least 1:2, at least 1:10, or in a range from 1:20 to 1:30. It is not inventive to state the optimum values of a thickness of the bearing portion. Although silent on the ratio of moduli of elasticity, the device of Oizumi et al inherently has an exact modulus of elasticity relative to the strength of connection desired. Through routine experimentation and optimization, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the wedge layers of Oizumi et al in view to have the ratio of the lower modulus of elasticity to the a higher modulus of elasticity is at least 1:2, at least 1:10, or in a range from 1:20 to 1:30 because this is merely the application of the of the expected level of skill on the part of one of ordinary skill producing expected and predictable results.

Regarding claim 8, Oizumi et al disclose the anchorage wherein the wedge-shaped layer has a lower modulus of elasticity being formed by two partial wedge-shaped layers (4,5) with different moduli of elasticity.

Regarding claim 15, Oizumi et al disclose an anchorage for at least one pre-tensioned or stressed tensile element, the anchorage comprising:

- an anchor body (3);

- a first wedge-shaped layer (4) having a wedge shape;

- a second wedge-shaped layer (2) adjacent the first wedge-shaped layer and having a wedge shape, the first and second wedge-shaped layers having a first regions near a load and a second region remote from the load;

- wherein a tensile force is transmittable to the anchor body by means of the first and second wedge shaped layers;

- wherein the first and second wedge-shaped layers and the anchor body include an inclined surface (Fig 3) to force the first and second wedge shaped layers against the at least one pre-tensioned or stressed tensile element (S), wherein the first wedge-shaped has a modulus of elasticity (concrete) that is lower compared to the modulus of elasticity of other parts of the anchorage including the second wedge-shaped layer (metal), wherein a greatest thickness of the first wedge-shaped layer, measured normal to the longitudinal axis of the tensile element, lies in the first region of the anchorage which is near the load and wherein a total thickness of the first and second wedge-

Art Unit: 3679

shaped layers is smallest in the first region of the anchorage which is near the load (Fig 3).

Regarding claim 16, Oizumi et al disclose an anchorage wherein the first and second wedge-shaped layers form a wedge and the inclined surface is between the wedge and the anchor body (Fig 3).

Regarding claim 17, Oizumi et al disclose an anchorage wherein the first wedge-shaped layer is part of the anchor body and the inclined surface is formed between the first and second wedge shaped layers (Fig 3).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 9 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oizumi et al as applied to claims 1-8, 10-13 and 15-17 above, and further in view of Ozawa et al (US Patent 5,802,788).

Oizumi et al disclose the anchorage significantly as claimed, but do not disclose at least one of the wedge and the anchor body being formed from a material having the higher modulus of elasticity and is provided with filling materials that result in the higher modulus of elasticity, wherein the filling materials are formed from Al_2O_3 .

Ozawa et al teach a similar anchorage system having a wedge being formed with aluminum alloy "for capability of appropriate plastic deformation" (Col 9, Lines 7-12). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the wedge of Oizumi et al to be provided with filling materials that result in the higher modulus of elasticity, wherein the filling materials are formed from Al_2O_3 as taught by Ozawa et al for capability of appropriate plastic deformation.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-17 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JOSHUA T. KENNEDY whose telephone number is (571)272-8297. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 7am - 3:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Daniel P. Stodola can be reached on (571) 272-7087. The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3679

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Joshua T. Kennedy/
Examiner, Art Unit 3679
3/9/2009

/Daniel P. Stodola/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3679